(*b*) The Motor Vehicles Regulation and Rules are intended to prevent such accidents. The question of improving the arrangements for preventing such accidents is receiving continuous attention.

(*c*) and (*d*) No such rule has been made.

(*e*) The suggestion will be considered.

Supplementary Questions and Answers.

Mr. N. G. Sanjeeviah.—

With reference to answer (*e*) are Government going to dispose of the matter without reference to the bus owners?

Second Member of Council.—

We cannot say. Such cases have not come to our notice.

At the request of the members, the President agreed to take up further questions after lunch.

Before proceeding to the Government business on the agenda, MR. H. C. DASAPPA and other members suggested that copies of Interpellations with answers might be supplied to them at least a week in advance to enable them to think over and ask supplementary questions, if any.

THE DEWAN replying said that the practice in vogue in Madras and elsewhere was being followed in Mysore. It was usual to supply Interpellations with answers only on the opening day of the meeting and a departure from this long standing arrangement would cause inconvenience.

MESSRS. D. S. MALLAPPA, H. C. DASAPPA and others suggested that at least the questions without answers, and representations might be supplied to the members a week in advance.

THE THIRD MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that the suggestion would be considered.

BILLS.

I. General Principles of the Bill to amend the Designation of the Chief Court of Mysore.

THE LAW SECRETARY, TO GOVERNMENT explained that a resolution was tabled more than once for discussion in the Legislative Council suggesting that the Chief Court might be designated as the High Court of Judicature. It was proposed to accept this suggestion. In British India and

in some Indian States, the highest courts of civil and criminal appeal, reference and revision were called High Courts. The name "High Court" was more suitable to the Chief Court in Mysore also, it being the highest court of appeal, reference and revision. It was accordingly proposed to introduce a Bill for substituting "High Court of Mysore" and "Chief Justice" respectively wherever the words "Chief Court of Mysore" and "Chief Judge" occurred in any Regulation or law in force in Mysore.

MR. DASAPPA said that if it was proposed to change the present name of Chief Court into High Court and of the Chief Judge to Chief Justice, the designation of the Government Advocate might similarly be changed into Advocate-General as in British Indian Provinces.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that that did not require any amendment of the Regulation.

MR. NILGIRI SANJIVIAH suggested that as in Madras and elsewhere, the Judges of the Chief Court might be recruited from different communities, as the customs and the social laws of the communities were not all alike.

THE DEWAN replied that it was an altogether different matter and did not arise for consideration on the present occasion.

MR. B. NARASINGA RAO was of opinion that if it was proposed to change the name of the Chief Court into High Court the powers of the Court should also be enhanced so as to be in keeping with the practice in British India. His own view was that the proposed change was more a matter of sentiment than a necessity. He also thought that it was necessary to limit the term of a Judge and also to fix his salary definitely so that he might not have to look forward for further promotion from the Executive. This arrangement would tend to maintain the independence of the Judiciary.

MR. HOSAKOPPA KRISHNA RAO supported Mr. Narasinga Rao in his views and said that what the people cared most was that the Chief Court should deal out justice in an even-handed manner and that they did not concern themselves at all with questions about changing its name or raising the pay of the Judges, and so on. To realise this object, the Judges should be independent of the Executive; their pay, pension, gratuity, etc., should be fixed definitely and no sort of inducement should be placed in their way. Such means alone were conducive to the maintenance of unimpaired judicial independence. He suggested the postponement of the Bill to a later session, the interval being

utilised to examine its provisions closely in the direction indicated by him.

THE THIRD MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that the question before the House was only about altering the designation of the Chief Court of Mysore. Other matters like the recruitment of Judges, fixing their term of office, their salary, etc., were not germane to the issue. These were purely matters for His Highness' consideration and a discussion upon them would be inappropriate.

The Bill was thereupon put to vote and carried by a large majority. Only three members were against it.

II. Bill to amend Section 103, Land Revenue Code.

THE LAW SECRETARY explained the general principles of the Bill as follows :—

"Section 103 of the Land Revenue Code is an independent and fundamental provision applicable to all delegations of powers to superior holders, whether under Section 99 proper, or under the last proviso thereto.

"It is found necessary to permit a relaxation in the case of both the Yelandur and Sringeri Jahgirs, of the restriction contained in Section 103.

"The extension of the period for the adoption of the summary process from two to six years would be an adequate recognition of the special standing of these two Jahgirs and affords a reasonable solution of the difficulty under which they would otherwise be placed. Hence the necessity for the amendment."

He then proposed the following amendment :—

"The power conferred by any such commission shall extend only to the enforcement of the payment of the revenue or rent of the current revenue year and, in the case of the Jahgirs of Sringeri and Yelandur, of five revenue years and, in other cases, of one revenue year, immediately preceding the current revenue year."

The majority of the House were not in favour of the changes proposed. MR. YELANDUR SRINIVASIENGAR contended that the Jahgirdar was giving little or no attention to the welfare of his raiyats. Though taxes in various forms were being collected by the Jahgirdar by holding out promises to the raiyats, yet none of the promises were carried out. The raiyats were put to untold misery and hardship. If it was not possible for the Jahgirdar to collect taxes due from the raiyats, he was at liberty to resort to civil courts. If,

on the other hand, the period of 2 years was extended to 6 years, the Jahgirdar would keep silent for 5 years and then take coercive steps to collect the accumulated arrears in one lump which it would be impossible for the raiyats to pay with the result that their lands would be lost to them. As it was, the condition of the tanks in the Yelandur Jahgir was anything but satisfactory. The Jahgirdar paid visits to the Jahgir very rarely and he was not acquainted with the condition of the people. The tanks were not kept in proper repair. While the water in the tanks was not sufficient for the lands under them, atchkat would be increased on the promise of improvement of the capacity of the tank. But nothing would be done while the raiyats would be compelled to pay full assessment although they could not get any crop. It would have been right on the part of Government to interfere in cases where the raiyats had refused to pay land revenue but the present case was one in which the raiyats were paying taxes regularly while the Jahgirdars were not at all discharging their obligations in the matter of keeping a permanent staff for the timely collection of assessment. This would be obvious if the records were gone into. In the face of these facts, it was not sound policy to invest Jahgirdars with enhanced powers.

MR. NILGIRI SANJIVIAH suggested the appointment of a Commission to go into the whole question and make suggestions. He further said that if Government were bent on giving additional powers to Jahgirdars, they should be made subject to certain conditions to ensure that the powers wre not wrongly exercised and that the raiyats were not oppressed.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL explained that if the Jahgirdars were not able to restore tanks, etc., it was because the raiyats did not pay their contributions. He thought that if the members wished that Government should retain discretionary powers for interference in the administration of the Jahgirs, it was quite a different matter.

MR. DASAPPA said that it was a surprise why this subject was brought up for discussion when justice could be easily had in civil courts. No explanation of this point was given, and after all there was no difficulty in continuing the existing practice.

As the House appeared to be against the measure, the Bill was dropped.

III. Bill to further amend the Mysore District Boards Regulation, 1926.

Whereas it is expedient to further amend the Mysore District Board Regulation, 1926, in certain particulars, it is hereby enacted as follows:—

In Section 35 of the Mysore District Boards Regulation, 1926, (1) the word "and" occurring after the words "the District Inspector of Schools" shall be substituted by a comma and (2) between the words "Assistant Registrar of Co-operative Societies" and the word "shall," the following shall be inserted:—

Amendment of Section 35.

"and the District Economic Superintendents and such other officers as may be notified by the Government from time to time in this behalf."

Statement of Objects and Reasons.

Under the duties assigned to the District Economic Superintendents in Government Order No. D. 4175-234—E.C. 28-28-1, dated 11th December 1928, they have to attend, as far as possible, all meetings of the District Boards in their District and furnish information regarding the progress of Economic Development work in the District and prepare and investigate any scheme that might be referred to them. The Superintendents are already on the Economic Committee of the District Boards and with a view to make themselves felt there and give a statutory recognition to their relation with the District Board, it is considered necessary to include the District Economic Superintendents in the list mentioned in Section 35 of the Mysore District Boards Regulation, of Government officers entitled to attend and speak at any meeting of the District Board or Committee thereof as specified in the said Section. It is also considered desirable to provide for the inclusion in the list of any other officers who may be notified by Government from time to time. The present Bill to amend Section 35 of the District Board Regulation is accordingly prepared.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL explained that it was considered necessary to require District Economic Superintendents to attend and speak at any meeting of the District Board or Committee and also to provide for the inclusion of any other officer or officers who might be notified by Government from time to time. Such officers would however have no power to vote.

The Bill was passed unanimously.

The Mines Regulation was postponed for consideration on the last day of the Session.

REPRESENTATIONS.

No. 1.—Conversion of Muzrai Investments in 3½ per cent. Government of India Pronotes to Fixed Deposits of Mysore Government Savings Bank.

Messrs. Soorappa, Sidlaghatta Municipality and B. M. Suryanaranappa, Sidlaghatta Taluk.

No. 2.—Interest on Charitable endowments.

Mr. A. Srikantappa, Dodballapur Municipality.

These were not discussed as the movers were absent.

No. 3.—Abolition of the levy of Irrigation Cess.

Messrs. M. S. Dyavegowda and Hosakoppa Krishna Rao, Koppa Taluk; K. T. Satyanarayana Setty, N. M. Sivalingappaiya and K. Thimmegowda, Kadur Taluk; G. Kariyanna, Minority Interest; M. Siddalingappa Setty, Chikmagalur Taluk; Dyavappagowda, Mudigere Taluk; B. P. Basappa Setty and Bagamane Devagowda, Chikmagalur Taluk.

MR. SATYANARAYANA SETTY said that irrigation cess was introduced only after the introduction of re-survey settlement. He considered it as a double levy and urged for its abolition.

MR. DYAVEGOWDA said that there was no necessity for the levy of irrigation cess in malnad parts as there was no difficulty felt for water in those parts. When a similar subject was brought up for discussion in the previous year, Government had promised to consider the question favourably. He urged that that promise might be given effect to.

MR. VENKATAPPA said that irrigation cess had already been included in land revenue and as such it should be abolished as a separate levy.

MR. NARASINGA RAO was also of the same opinion.

MR. C. NARASIMHIAH said that during the re-survey, land revenue was fixed for a period of 30 years and irrigation cess was levied as a separate cess. But in some taluks irrigation cess was merged in land revenue and the Settlement Officer did not take note of this fact.

MR. HOSAKOPPA KRISHNA RAO said that when this subject was brought up during the Dewanship of Sir Albion Banerji, it was admitted by Government that the separate levy of irrigation cess was unjust and a promise was held out in the Assembly that a favourable reply would be given in the Dewan's Concluding Remarks. This was not only not done but when the subject came up before the Legislative Council shortly thereafter, the Government took up a different